

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claim 1 is amended to further clarify the subject matter of the present invention. New claim 27 is added. No new matter has been added. Withdrawn claims 14-26 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to file these claims in a continuing application. Accordingly, claims 1-13 and 27 are presently pending in the application with claims 1-13 and 27.

**Telephone Interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of allowing a telephone interview on November 20 and December 5. As agreed during the interview, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed features to obviate the §102 rejections as explained below.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b)**

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “an organic emission layer has a blended structure, the blended structure including a block copolymer and an organic emission material.” The Office Action on page 3 alleges that Sakakibara et al. discloses an organic EL device including

“an organic emission layer [light-emitting layer 3 alleged to be the organic emission layer, FIG. 1] between the first and second electrodes, and having a blended structure of a block copolymer and an organic polymer emission material.” (Col. 2, line 45; col. 4 lines 5-15; col. 4, lines 19-24; col. 5, lines 22-30; col. 6, lines 13-39; col. 7, lines 19-28; and Table 1.) However, Sakakibara et al. is completely silent as to the alleged block copolymer being a blended structure including a block copolymer and an organic emission material as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of at least independent claim 1, hence dependent claims 2-13 which dependent from claim 1. Thus, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) be withdrawn.

As to claims 3-13, the Office dismisses the claimed features as being recited in a product-by-process format and therefore alleges that the claimed features are not given any patentable weight. Although Applicant disagrees, Sakakibara et al. fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least the reasons stated above. Hence, Sakakibara et al. fails to anticipate claims 2-13 for at least the same reasons. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the arguments with regard to claims 3-13 under the product-by-process analysis are moot.

#### **New Claim 27**

New claim 27 has been added. New claim 27 recites the subject matter of claim 1 and a portion of claim 3. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of newly added claim 27.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: December 11, 2006

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**

By:   
Sumiyo Onda  
Reg. No. L0289

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001